



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/423,109

10/29/1999

Jacques Paris

GEI-073

6348

23338 7590 01/11/2007
DENNISON, SCHULTZ & MACDONALD
1727 KING STREET
SUITE 105
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

QAZI, SABIHA NAIM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
--	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

01/11/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/423,109

Applicant(s)

PARIS ET AL.

Examiner

Sabiha Qazi

Art Unit

1616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 October 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,7,8,13,18-21,25,26,31 and 33-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-37 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 3,4,7,8,13,18-21,25,26 and 31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1616

Non-Final Office Action

Claims 3, 4, 7, 813, 18-21, 25, 26, 31 and 33-37 are pending. Claim 33-37 is withdrawn from consideration as non-elected invention. Amendments are entered. No claim is allowed.

Summary of this Office Action dated January 03, 2006

1. Information Disclosure Statement
2. Copending Applications
3. Specification
4. 35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Written Description Rejection
5. 35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Scope of Enablement Rejection
6. Double Patenting
7. 35 USC § 103(a) Obviousness Rejection – First Rejection
8. 35 USC § 103(a) Obviousness Rejection – Second Rejection
9. Response to Remarks
10. Communication

Art Unit: 1616

Information Disclosure Statement

The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609.04(a) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Copending Applications

Applicants must bring to the attention of the examiner, or other Office official involved with the examination of a particular application, information within their knowledge as to other **copending United States applications**, which are "material to patentability" of the application in question. MPEP 2001.06(b). See *Dayco Products Inc. v. Total Containment Inc.*, 66 USPQ2d 1801 (CA FC 2003).

Specification

The specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.

Original Presentation

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, method of use claims invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 33-37 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

35 USC § 112 --- First Paragraph Written Description Rejection

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 3, 3, 7, 8, 18-21, 25, 26, 31 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Art Unit: 1616

There is no written description for the treating estrogen deficiency and reducing bone resorption as has been claimed. Applicant has no possession of the invention of the subject matter as claimed at the time of filing the application. Applicant is kindly requested to explain the issue.

The written description requirement prevents applications from using the amendment process to update the disclosure in their disclosures. (claims or specification) during the pendency before the patent office. Otherwise applicants could add new matter to their disclosures and date them back to their original filing date, thus defeating an accurate accounting of the priority of the invention. See 35 USC 132. The function of description requirement is to ensure that the inventor had possession, as of filing date of the application relied on, the specific subject matter claimed by him. See *Genetech*, 108 F 3d 1361, 1365 (Fed. Cir. at 1366, 78, 1999).

The test for determining compliance with the written description requirement is whether the disclosure of the application as originally filed reasonably conveys to one skilled in the art that the inventor had the possession at the time of the later claimed subject matter, rather than the presence or absence of literal support in the specification for the claimed language. See *In re Kaslow*, 707 F 2d 1366, 1375 (Fed. Cir. 1983).

In the present case Applicant has no possession of method of treatment as now claimed in this application.

See MPEP 2163.06. For Applicants convenience relevant portion is cited as follows.

**GENERAL PRINCIPLES GOVERNING COMPLIANCE WITH THE
"WRITTEN DESCRIPTION" REQUIREMENT FOR APPLICATIONS**

The first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 requires that the "specification shall contain a written description of the invention * * *." This requirement is separate and distinct from the enablement requirement. See, e.g., *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d 1555, 1560, 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1114 (Fed. Cir. 1991). >See also *Univ. of Rochester v. G.D. Searle & Co.*, 358 F.3d 916, 920-23, 69 USPQ2d 1886, 1890-93 (Fed. Cir. 2004) (discussing history and purpose of the written description requirement); *In re Curtis*, 354 F.3d 1347, 1357, 69 USPQ2d 1274, 1282 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("conclusive evidence of a claim's enablement is not equally conclusive of that claim's satisfactory written description").< The written description requirement has several policy objectives. "[T]he 'essential goal' of the description of the invention requirement is to clearly convey the information that an applicant has invented the subject matter which is claimed." *In re Barker*, 559 F.2d 588, 592 n.4, 194 USPQ 470, 473 n.4 (CCPA 1977). Another objective is to put the public in possession of what the applicant claims as the invention. See *Regents of the University of California v. Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1566, 43 USPQ2d 1398, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1997), *cert. denied*, 523 U.S. 1089 (1998). The written description requirement of the Patent Act promotes the progress of the useful arts by ensuring that patentees adequately describe their inventions in their patent specifications in exchange for the right to exclude others from practicing the invention for the duration of the patent's term.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art

Art Unit: 1616

can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003); *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116. However, a showing of possession alone does not cure the lack of a written description. *Enzo Biochem, Inc. v. Gen-Probe, Inc.*, 323 F.3d 956, 969-70, 63 USPQ2d 1609, 1617 (Fed. Cir. 2002). Much of the written description case law addresses whether the specification as originally filed supports claims not originally in the application. The issue raised in the cases is most often phrased as whether the original application provides "adequate support" for the claims at issue or whether the material added to the specification incorporates "new matter" in violation of 35 U.S.C. 132. The "written description" question similarly arises in the interference context, where the issue is whether the specification of one party to the interference can support the newly added claims corresponding to the count at issue, i.e., whether that party can "make the claim" corresponding to the interference count. See, e.g., *Martin v. Mayer*, 823 F.2d 500, 503, 3 USPQ2d 1333, 1335 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In addition, early opinions suggest the Patent and Trademark Office was unwilling to find written descriptive support when the only description was found in the claims; however, this viewpoint was rejected. See *In re Koller*, 613 F.2d 819, 204 USPQ 702 (CCPA 1980) (original claims constitute their own description); accord *In re Gardner*, 475 F.2d 1389, 177 USPQ 396 (CCPA 1973); accord *In re Wertheim*, 541 F.2d 257, 191 USPQ 90 (CCPA 1976). It is now well accepted that a satisfactory description may be in the claims or any other portion of the originally filed specification. These early opinions did not address the quality or specificity of particularity that was required in the description, i.e., how much description is enough.

An applicant shows possession of the claimed invention by describing the claimed invention with all of its limitations using such descriptive means as

Art Unit: 1616

words, structures, figures, diagrams, and formulas that fully set forth the claimed invention. *Lockwood v. American Airlines, Inc.*, 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Possession may be shown in a variety of ways including description of an actual reduction to practice, or by showing that the invention was "ready for patenting" such as by the disclosure of drawings or structural chemical formulas that show that the invention was complete, or by describing distinguishing identifying characteristics sufficient to show that the applicant was in possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Pfaff v. Wells Elecs., Inc.*, 525 U.S. 55, 68, 119 S.Ct. 304, 312, 48 USPQ2d 1641, 1647 (1998); *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d at 1568, 43 USPQ2d at 1406; *Amgen, Inc. v. Chugai Pharmaceutical*, 927 F.2d 1200, 1206, 18 USPQ2d 1016, 1021 (Fed. Cir. 1991) (one must define a compound by "whatever characteristics sufficiently distinguish it"). "Compliance with the written description requirement is essentially a fact-based inquiry that will 'necessarily vary depending on the nature of the invention claimed.'" *Enzo Biochem*, **>323 F.3d at 963<, 63 USPQ2d at 1613. An application specification may show actual reduction to practice by describing testing of the claimed invention or, in the case of biological materials, by specifically describing a deposit made in accordance with 37 CFR 1.801 et seq. See *Enzo Biochem*, **>323 F.3d at 965<, 63 USPQ2d at 1614 ("reference in the specification to a deposit may also satisfy the written description requirement with respect to a claimed material"); see also Deposit of Biological Materials for Patent Purposes, Final Rule, 54 FR 34,864 (August 22, 1989) ("The requirement for a specific identification is consistent with the description requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112, and to provide an antecedent basis for the biological material which either has been or will be deposited before the patent is granted." Id. at 34,876. "The description must be sufficient to permit verification that the deposited biological material is in fact that disclosed. Once the patent issues, the description must be sufficient to aid in the resolution of

Art Unit: 1616

questions of infringement." *Id.* at 34,880.). Such a deposit is not a substitute for a written description of the claimed invention. The written description of the deposited material needs to be as complete as possible because the examination for patentability proceeds solely on the basis of the written description. See, e.g., *In re Lundak*, 773 F.2d 1216, 227 USPQ 90 (Fed. Cir. 1985). See also 54 FR at 34,880 ("As a general rule, the more information that is provided about a particular deposited biological material, the better the examiner will be able to compare the identity and characteristics of the deposited biological material with the prior art.").

A question as to whether a specification provides an adequate written description may arise in the context of an original claim which is not described sufficiently (see, e.g., *Enzo Biochem*, **323** F.3d at 968, 63 USPQ2d at 1616 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Eli Lilly*, 119 F.3d 1559, 43 USPQ2d 1398), a new or amended claim wherein a claim limitation has been added or removed, or a claim to entitlement of an earlier priority date or effective filing date under 35 U.S.C. **119**, **120**, or **365(c)**. Most typically, the issue will arise in the context of determining whether new or amended claims are supported by the description of the invention in the application as filed (see, e.g., *In re Wright*, 866 F.2d 422, 9 USPQ2d 1649 (Fed. Cir. 1989)), whether a claimed invention is entitled to the benefit of an earlier priority date or effective filing date under 35 U.S.C. **119**, **120**, or **365(c)** (see, e.g., *New Railhead Mfg. L.L.C. v. Vermeer Mfg. Co.*, 298 F.3d 1290, 63 USPQ2d 1843 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *Tronzo v. Biomet, Inc.*, 156 F.3d 1154, 47 USPQ2d 1829 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *Fiers v. Revel*, 984 F.2d 1164, 25 USPQ2d 1601 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Ziegler*, 992 F.2d 1197, 1200, 26 USPQ2d 1600, 1603 (Fed. Cir. 1993)), or whether a specification provides support for a claim corresponding to a count in an interference (see, e.g., *Fields v. Conover*, 443 F.2d 1386, 170 USPQ 276 (CCPA 1971)). Compliance with the written description requirement is a question of fact

Art Unit: 1616

which must be resolved on a case-by-case basis. *Vas-Cath, Inc. v. Mahurkar*, 935 F.2d at 1563, 19 USPQ2d at 1116 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

2163.06 Relationship of Written Description Requirement to New Matter

Lack of written description is an issue that generally arises with respect to the subject matter of a claim. If an applicant amends or attempts to amend the abstract, specification or drawings of an application, an issue of new matter will arise if the content of the amendment is not described in the application as filed. Stated another way, information contained in any one of the specification, claims or drawings of the application as filed may be added to any other part of the application without introducing new matter.

There are two statutory provisions that prohibit the introduction of new matter: **35 U.S.C. 132** - No amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention; and, similarly providing for a reissue application, **35 U.S.C. 251** - No new matter shall be introduced into the application for reissue.

35 U.S.C. 112 Specification. - Patent Laws

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same, and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 3, 4, 7, 8, 18-21, 25, 26, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for the combination of NOMAC and estradiol valerate, does not reasonably provide enablement for a method of treating estrogen deficiency and reducing bone resorption.

The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims.

There is no support to show how osteoporosis can be prevented or estrogen deficiencies can be corrected in the disclosure.

The factors to be considered in determining whether a disclosure meets the enablement requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, have been described in *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Among these factors are: (1) the nature of the invention; (2) the state of the prior art; (3) the relative skill of those in the art; (4) the predictability or unpredictability of the art; (5) the breadth of the claims; (6) the amount

Art Unit: 1616

of direction or guidance presented; (7) the presence or absence of working examples; and (8) the quantity of experimentation necessary. When the above factors are weighed, it is the examiner's position that one skilled in the art could not practice the invention without undue experimentation.

(1) The nature of the invention:

The claims are drawn to a method of treating estrogenic deficiency and bone resorption.

(2) The predictability or unpredictability of the art

The "predictability or lack thereof" in the art refers to the ability of one skilled in the art to extrapolate the disclosed or known results to the claimed invention. If one skilled in the art can readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which the claimed invention pertains, then there is predictability in the art. On the other hand, if one skilled in the art cannot readily anticipate the effect of a change within the subject matter to which that claimed invention pertains, then there is lack of predictability in the art. Accordingly, what is known in the art provides evidence as to the question of predictability. In particular, the court in *In re Marzocchi*, 439 F.2d 220, 223-24, 169 USPQ 367, 369-70 (CCPA 1971), stated:

[I]n the field of chemistry generally, there may be times when the well-known unpredictability of chemical reactions will alone be enough to create a reasonable doubt as to the accuracy of a particular broad statement put forward as enabling support for a

Art Unit: 1616

claim. This will especially be the case where the statement is, on its face, contrary to generally accepted scientific principles. Most often, additional factors, such as the teachings in pertinent references, will be available to substantiate any doubts that the asserted scope of objective enablement is in fact commensurate with the scope of protection sought and to support any demands based thereon for proof.

The scope of the required enablement varies inversely with the degree of predictability involved, but even in unpredictable arts, a disclosure of every operable species is not required. A single embodiment may provide broad enablement in cases involving predictable factors, such as mechanical or electrical elements. *In re Vickers*, 141 F.2d 522, 526-27, 61 USPQ 122, 127 (CCPA 1944); *In re Cook*, 439 F.2d 730, 734, 169 USPQ 298, 301 (CCPA 1971). However, in applications directed to inventions in arts where the results are unpredictable, the disclosure of a single species usually does not provide an adequate basis to support generic claims. *In re Soll*, 97 F.2d 623, 624, 38 USPQ 189, 191 (CCPA 1938). In cases involving unpredictable factors, such as most chemical reactions and physiological activity, more may be required. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity). See also *In re Wright*, 999 F.2d 1557, 1562, 27 USPQ2d 1510, 1513 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 496, 20 USPQ2d 1438, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1991). This is because it is not obvious from the disclosure of one species, what other species will work. See MPEP 2164.03.

Art Unit: 1616

(3) The breadth of the claims

The claims are broad because the Applicants are claiming "correcting estrogen deficiencies". There are many different types of estrogen deficiencies; they have only **one** example (endometrium) to support their claim for **all** estrogen deficiencies, as shown in the Disclosure. See Plunkett et al. (US Re. 36,247) and Blanc et al. (Clinical Therapeutics, 1998), 20(5), 901-912).

In re Fisher, 427 F.2d 833, 166 USPQ 18 (CCPA 1970) (contrasting mechanical and electrical elements with chemical reactions and physiological activity). See also In re Wright, 999 F.2d 1557, 27 USPQ2d 1510 (Fed. Cir. 1993); In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). It is not obvious from the disclosure of one species, what other species will work.

In re Dreshfield, 110 F.2d 235, 45 USPQ 36 (CCPA 1940), gives this general rule: "It is well settled that in cases involving chemicals and chemical compounds, which differ radically in their properties it must appear in an applicant's specification either by the enumeration of a sufficient number of the members of a group or by other appropriate language, that the chemicals or chemical combinations included in the claims are capable of accomplishing the desired result."

(4) The amount of direction or guidance presented

There is no guidance needed to enable one skilled in the art to successfully prevent osteoporosis and/or correct any estrogen deficiencies in the disclosure. The amount of guidance or direction needed to enable the invention is inversely related to

Art Unit: 1616

the amount of knowledge in the state of the art as well as the predictability in the art. *In re Fisher*, 427 F.2d 833, 839, 166 USPQ 18, 24 (CCPA 1970). The "amount of guidance or direction" refers to that information in the application, as originally filed, that teaches exactly how to make or use the invention. The more that is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention, how to make, and how to use the invention, and the more predictable the art is, the less information needs to be explicitly stated in the specification. In contrast, if little is known in the prior art about the nature of the invention and the art is unpredictable, the specification would need more detail as to how to make and use the invention in order to be enabling. >See, e.g., *Chiron Corp. v. Genentech Inc.*, 363 F.3d 1247, 1254, 70 USPQ2d 1321, 1326 (Fed. Cir. 2004) ("Nascent technology, however, must be enabled with a 'specific and useful teaching.' The law requires an enabling disclosure for nascent technology because a person of ordinary skill in the art has little or no knowledge independent from the patentee's instruction. Thus, the public's end of the bargain struck by the patent system is a full enabling disclosure of the claimed technology."

(5) The presence or absence of working examples

The disclosure does not contain enough examples to give guidance needed to enable one skilled in the art to prevent osteoporosis and/or correct any estrogen deficiencies. A disclosure should contain representative examples, which provide reasonable assurance to one skilled in the art that the compounds fall within the scope

Art Unit: 1616

of a claim will possess the alleged activity. See *In re Riat et al.* (CCPA 1964) 327 F2d 685, 140 USPQ 471; *In re Barr et al.* (CCPA 1971) 444 F 2d 349, 151 USPQ 724.

(6) The quantity of experimentation necessary

Since there is no guidance and/or direction provided by the Applicants, one skilled in the art would have to go through undue experimentation to make and/or use the instant invention.

The first paragraph of 35 USC 112 requires “...*such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains...*” The instant invention fails to meet this requirement, as it lacks such full, clear, and concise manner as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention.

Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Art Unit: 1616

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR

3.73(b).

2. Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 18-21, 25, 26, and 31 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of U.S. Patent No. 6,831,073. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because presently claimed invention is considered obvious over claims 1-6 of US '073.

3. Instant claims differ from the reference in claiming "correcting estrogen deficiency" and "preventing osteoporosis" wherein the claims of issued patent cites "a method of treating estrogenic deficiencies" and "avoiding the appearance of osteoporosis" which are obvious.

4. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to prepare addition beneficial composition useful for avoiding osteoporosis and to treat estrogenic deficiencies. Motivation has been provided in the claims and also in the specification. One who is familiar with the art would have been motivated to prepare compositions of estradiol ester such as the combination of estradiol valerate and nomegestrol acetate (NOMAC) and use for the treatment of estrogen deficiencies and to avoid osteoporosis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patent ability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patent ability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Art Unit: 1616

Claims 3, 4, 7, 8, 18-21, 25, 26, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Plunkett et al. (US Re. 36,247) and Blanc et al. (Clinical Therapeutics, 1998), 20(5), 901-912). Both the references teach the art, which embraces instantly, claimed invention. See the entire documents, especially cited below.

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.

Plunkett teaches a method of hormonal treatment for menopausal disorders involving continuous administration of progestagens and estrogens. See the entire document especially lines 40-51, col. 2; lines 63-67, col. 2; lines 1-67, col. 3; lines 18-25, and lines 1-5, col. 4; lines 46-50, col. 6.

The reference teaches continuous and uninterrupted administration of progestagen and estrogen. The actual unit dosage are selected according to conventionally known methods, e.g. body weight of patient and biological activity of hormones with the ultimate goal of producing the desired result with minimum quantities of hormones. It does not disclose specifically nomegesterol acetate.

Blanc et al teaches continuous hormone replacement therapy combining nomegesterol acetate and gel, patch or oral estrogen. See the abstract of the invention; cols 1 and 2 on page 903 col. 2 on page 904, Table 1 on page 905 Figure on page 906 ; Table II on page 907. Prior art also teach that bleeding occurs when treatment is discontinued.

2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

Art Unit: 1616

Instant claims are drawn to a method of treating deficiencies of estrogen by continuously administering a combination of estrogen and nomegestrol acetate. Blanc et al. teach the same combination, the ranges of the amounts overlap with the prior art teaching. Prior art teaches estradiol, 2 mg/dose whereas presently claimed amount is 0.3-3 mg and nomegestrol 2.5 mg/d whereas presently claimed amount 0.3 to 1.25 mg. The Plunkett et al differs from the instant invention in that it does not specifically name nomegestrol acetate. Presently claimed invention does not clearly state what is the amount of the steroids per dose per day.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to prepare a composition of NOMAc and estrogen to administer continuously combination of estrogen and nomegestrol as cited above.

4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Motivation is to use estrogen and progestagen continuously as taught by Plunkett et al. and use nomegestrol as progestagen because it gives in all patients regular, progestagen-induced withdrawal bleed each month; and histological, ultra structural and biochemical changes were induced within the endometrium by all doses (0.5 mg, 1.0 mg; and 2.5 mg) is a potent progestogen. Blanc et al. teach same combination as combination of nomegestrol and estradiol. Thus, there has been ample motivation

Art Unit: 1616

provided by the teachings of both the references cited above to prepare the instant invention in absence of any criticality or unexpected results.

Claim 31 is drawn to composition useful for hormone replacement therapy. The Examiner would like to emphasize that the two different intended uses are not distinguishable in terms of the composition, see *In re Thuau*, 57 USPQ 324; *Ex parte Douros*, 163 USPQ 667; and *In re Craige*, 89 USPQ 393. Composition is therefore considered obvious.

It has been established by the courts that a single species is seldom, if ever, sufficient to support a generic claim. *In re Shokal*, 242 F.2d 771, ___, 113 U.S.P.Q. 283, 285 (C.C.P.A. 1957). See also, *In re Grimme*, 274 F.2d 949, ___, 124 U.S.P.Q. 499, 501 (C.C.P.A. 1960) (the naming of a member of a genus or subgenus is not a proper basis for claiming the whole group).

Objective evidence of nonobviousness must be commensurate in scope with the scope of the claims. *In re Tiffin*, 171 USPQ 294. A showing limited to a single species can hardly be considered probative of the invention's nonobviousness in view of the breadth of the claims.

The new Declaration was considered, but was not found persuasive. The claims are too broad. Example 1 is drawn to the study on symptoms related to estrogen deficiencies by using .625 mg of NOMAC and .5mg of E2, 1.25 mg of NOMAC and 1mg of E2, and a placebo. Example 2 is drawn to the study of preventing osteoporosis. The results show that E2/NOMAC combinations of the invention were able to decrease bone

Art Unit: 1616

resorption, which the Applicants directly link to preventing osteoporosis. The Examiner respectfully disagrees; the decrease of bone resorption has not been shown and/or explained to prevent osteoporosis by all the combinations as claimed.

There is motivation provided by the prior art to select NOMAC because at high doses there is no bleeding pattern and have different effect on endometrium. Examiner notes, paragraph after Table 3 on page 4 of the declaration that applicant has cited the advantages which are known in the art.

In the light of the forgoing discussion, the Examiner's ultimate legal conclusion is that the subject matter defined by the instant claims would have been obvious within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Response to Remarks

- Applicants arguments for the claimed invention has been fully considered but was not found persuasive therefore rejections are maintained. The Applicants' arguments regarding the rejection over PLUNKETT et al and BLANC et al are not found persuasive. The Applicants argue that the ranges claimed in the instant invention are not taught in the prior art. It is well established that merely selecting proportions and ranges is not patentable absent a showing of criticality. In re Becket, 33 U.S.P.Q. 33 (C.C.P.A. 1937). In re Russell, 439 F.2d 1228, 169 U.S.P.Q. 426 (C.C.P.A. 1971).

Art Unit: 1616

Conclusion

1. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.


Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sabiha Qazi, Ph.D. whose telephone number is 571-272-0622. The examiner can normally be reached on any business day.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Johann Richter, Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0646. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1616

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


SABIHA QAZI, PH.D
PRIMARY EXAMINER